

# EXHIBIT 24

1 KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP  
2 JAN NIELSEN LITTLE - # 100029  
3 jlittle@keker.com  
4 ANDREW DAWSON - # 264421  
5 adawson@keker.com  
6 TRAVIS SILVA - # 295856  
7 tsilva@keker.com  
8 633 Battery Street  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
10 Telephone: 415 391 5400  
11 Facsimile: 415 397 7188

12 *Attorneys for Respondents*  
13 COUNTY OF SAN MATEO BOARD OF  
14 SUPERVISORS; COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
15 MIKE CALLAGY; ASSISTANT CLERK TO  
16 THE BOARD SUKHMANI S. PUREWAL



17 *EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES*  
18 *[GOVERNMENT CODE § 6103]*

19 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
20 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

21 SHERIFF CHRISTINA CORPUS,

22 Petitioner,

23 v.

24 COUNTY OF SAN MATEO BOARD OF  
25 SUPERVISORS; COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
26 MIKE CALLAGY; ASSISTANT CLERK TO  
27 THE BOARD SUKHMANI S. PUREWAL;  
28 and DOES 1-10,

Respondents.

Case No. 25-CIV-04319

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING  
PETITIONER'S APPLICATION FOR EX  
PARTE AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE**

Date: June 27, 2025  
Time: 1:30 p.m.  
Dept.: 11  
Judge: Hon. Nina Shapirshteyn

Date Filed: June 9, 2025

Trial Date: Not yet set

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S APPLICATION FOR EX PARTE AND PETITION FOR WRIT  
OF MANDATE**

Case No. 25-CIV-04319

2995014

Petitioner's "Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause Re: Preliminary Injunction" ("Application") came on <sup>ex parte</sup> for hearing before me on June 27, 2025.

Re:

The Board of Supervisors ("Board") has initiated administrative proceedings to remove Petitioner from the office of Sheriff of San Mateo County pursuant to section 412.5 of the County Charter and procedures adopted by the Board pursuant to that section of the County Charter. The Application seeks to enjoin the ongoing administrative removal proceeding.

The Court denies the Application.

As a threshold matter, Petitioner raised substantially the same arguments in an ex parte application presented to a different judge in Department 28 on June 9, 2025. There is no written order memorializing the June 9 hearing, but the parties agree that the Court denied the Application on June 9, and Petitioner concedes that on June 9 the Court found that a TRO application was premature. While the undersigned judge was not present at the June 9 hearing, the Court will consider the prior case history when considering this ex parte application.

~~Since June 9, additional steps have occurred in the administrative removal process.~~ On June 24, the Board adopted a "Final Notice of Decision" removing Petitioner from office. However, the administrative process is not yet complete, and Petitioner currently remains in her position as Sheriff. Under section 412.5 and its implementing procedures, Petitioner has the right to an administrative appeal of the Board's June 24 decision, and Petitioner will remain as the sheriff during the pendency of that appeal.

Petitioner argues that in light of the Board's action, her Application is now ripe even if it was not ripe on June 9. Respondents argue that the Board's action is not final, and the Application is not ripe, because an administrative appeal is available and Petitioner has not exhausted administrative remedies.

The Court agrees with Respondents and ~~again~~ denies Petitioner's request for extraordinary relief. "It is a well-recognized rule in this state that if an administrative remedy is provided by


1 statute, relief must be sought from the administrative body and such remedy must be exhausted  
 2 before judicial review of the administrative action is available.” *Alta Loma Sch. Dist. v. San*  
 3 *Bernardino Cnty. Com. On Sch. Dist. Reorganization*, 124 Cal. App. 3d 542, 554 (1981); *see also*  
 4 *McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners*, 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 717 (1947) (“[E]ach step in the  
 5 administrative proceeding cannot be reviewed separately, any more than each ruling in the trial of  
 6 a civil action may be separately reviewed by a separate appeal.”). The exhaustion requirement “is  
 7 not a matter of discretion; compliance is a jurisdictional prerequisite to judicial review.” *Alta*  
 8 *Loma Sch. Dist.*, 124 Cal. App. 3d at 554.

9 The Court lacks jurisdiction until such time as Petitioner has exhausted administrative  
 10 remedies. *Alta Loma Sch. Dist.*, 124 Cal. App. 3d at 554. The Court will not review interim steps  
 11 of the administrative process. *McPheeters*, 82 Cal. App. 2d at 717. The Board has not yet  
 12 rendered a “final decision” with a “direct and immediate impact” on Petitioner, meaning that  
 13 judicial review is premature. *Santa Barbara Cnty. Flower & Nursery Growers Assn. v. Cnty. of*  
 14 *Santa Barbara*, 121 Cal. App. 4th 864, 875 (2004). Administrative proceedings will “promote[]  
 15 judicial efficiency by unearthing the relevant evidence and providing a record that the court may  
 16 review.” *Unnamed Physician v. Bd. of Trs. of Saint Agnes Med. Ctr.*, 93 Cal. App. 4th 607, 619  
 17 (2001). Furthermore, the fact that Petitioner will remain in office as sheriff cuts against any  
 18 argument that she will suffer irreparable harm by exhausting administrative remedies. *Church of*  
 19 *Christ in Hollywood v. Superior Ct.*, 99 Cal. App. 4th 1244, 1251 (2002) (plaintiff must show  
 20 “interim harm” as part of TRO analysis).

21 In light of the Court’s jurisdictional ruling, it need not consider Petitioner’s remaining  
 22 arguments. The temporary restraining order is denied and any other relief sought by the  
 23 Application is denied as moot.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: June 27, 2025

26  
 27   
 28 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT